

look at this situation, to give constructive advice to Senator LOTT and yourself. I think that, hopefully, that message will get to the administration.

At the moment, I am expressing my own view. I am not satisfied with what I have seen in the open about this plan. I think it has to incorporate pieces which will bring about a stabilization of the potential conflict that could take place in the aftermath of an airstrike.

The Senator rightly points out we had the Joint Chiefs before the Armed Services Committee the other day seeking additional funds for critical needs in our forces, and we have now expended by our Nation up to \$9 billion in Bosnia—much of that coming out of the military budget. It is unprogrammed, unbudgeted. We are taking funds out of R&D, operation and maintenance accounts. That has a direct adverse effect on the readiness and the lifestyle of our men and women in the Armed Forces.

We will take steps to correct that, but I think the Senator is absolutely right. I thank the Senator and the distinguished majority leader for the work they have done.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, to conclude the dialog on Kosovo, the administration gave most Members of the Senate a briefing yesterday, but they have a lot of work to do. They have a lot of work to do if they are going to convince the Congress, if they are going to convince the American people. They have a lot of leveling with the American people as far as the expense, as far as the obligation, as far as what the next step is after the first phase. They haven't answered those questions.

That is not exactly what I call "consulting with Congress." Maybe we had a little dialog with the administration, but we have a lot of work to do yet.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague for bringing that up. I participated, of course, in those briefings.

I am not here to advocate the U.S. ground forces in Kosovo. It seems to me if there is an air operation that the United States—because of its particular type of aircraft and munitions—would have to take a lead in that and then the role of the stabilization force should fall to other allies, in my judgment. I think you can't have one without the other.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ACT

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, earlier today, I, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator SPECTER, Senator COATS, Senator AKAKA, as well as Congressman WOLF, and other leaders of various religious organizations, had a press conference

discussing the International Religious Freedom Act. We came out and spoke in favor of Congress passing the International Religious Freedom Act this year.

I tell my colleagues, I very much hope and expect we will do that. I think it is one of the highest priorities we have left before we adjourn this session.

The issue of religious persecution and freedom is an issue that I have been working on, as many others have, for a long time. I very much value the opportunity and the right and the privilege that I have as an American citizen to worship as I please, where I please, how I please. In fact, I believe it is one of the most precious rights that any of us have as a citizen of this country.

Unfortunately, too many people in too many countries do not have that right. It is unfortunate that in many places all around the world, religious persecution is a common practice. It happens in more countries than we can imagine. There are far too many state laws and policies that restrict religious freedom.

For many years, I have worked with my colleagues, Senator HELMS, Senator LUGAR and Senator Nunn, to help win freedom for those around the world who suffer because of religious beliefs. While we have been successful on many occasions, sadly, in some cases, we haven't been. Most of this work has been done, I might mention, quietly and behind the scenes.

In 1996, I was honored to sponsor a Senate resolution on religious persecution, which passed by unanimous consent. In that resolution, the Senate made a strong recommendation "that the President expand and invigorate the United States' international advocacy on behalf of persecuted Christians, and initiate a thorough examination of all the United States' policies that affect persecuted Christians."

Unlike the resolution that we helped get through the Senate 2 years ago, the legislation we are talking about today makes no distinction as to the faith of those who are being persecuted. This bill, I believe, will benefit all persons of all faiths who are persecuted for practicing their religion.

Congressman FRANK WOLF and Senator ARLEN SPECTER have done a great job during the past year and a half in bringing this issue to the attention of the American public. I want to thank my friend, Congressman WOLF, for his leadership in the House, and of course all those persons in the House who passed a similar bill with a record vote, 375-41. Now, we in the Senate have a historic opportunity to finish the job that was started by the House, by passing the International Religious Freedom Act.

I also want to thank my colleague, Senator SPECTER, for his leadership as original sponsor of the resolution. His work on our legislation, I think, has added considerably to the effectiveness of the bill.

I also want to thank Senators GRAMS and HAGEL who worked with us to modify the bill to ensure that what we are doing is responsible and it is done in a careful way. I think with their efforts we have crafted a bill that can be supported by all Senators, as evidenced by the fact that a broad spectrum of grassroots organizations have endorsed this bill.

We have 29 Senate cosponsors, and I expect we will have more shortly. We have 21 groups that are supporting our bill who are advocating religious freedom. Those organizations include: the Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, the National Association of Evangelicals, the International Fellowship of Jews and Christians, the Christian Coalition, the Episcopal Church, the Anti-Defamation League, Advocates International, the National Jewish Coalition, Traditional Values Coalition, American Jewish Committee, Justice Fellowship, the Catholic Conference, B'Nai B'rith International, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men's Institutes, Jewish Council for Public Affairs, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, National Conference of Soviet Jewry, the United Methodist Church-Women's Division, and the American Coptic Association.

The Episcopal Church stated the following about the International Religious Freedom Act in a letter to each office on Capitol Hill:

The Nickles-Lieberman bill is a moderate, flexible response to human rights abuses that strikes the right balance between imposing inflexible sanctions in overlooking serious human rights abuses.

The Catholic conference stated the following in a letter to my office:

The bill is a reasonable and thoughtful effort to ensure that religious liberty has its rightful place in U.S. policy while preserving the authority of the Executive to pursue legitimate foreign policy goals. It deserves broad, bipartisan support and should be considered before Congress adjourns.

B'nei B'rith International, The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America signed a letter to me stating:

Passage of this bill would underscore our nation's commitment to human rights worldwide and lend hope to millions of religious believers who suffer because of their faith. Failure to act now on this legislation would send a dangerous signal to persecutors that they can act with impunity.

Unfortunately, it is a tragic reality that literally millions of religious believers around the world live with the terrifying prospect of persecution—of being tortured, arrested, imprisoned, or even killed simply for their faith. Millions more around the world are denied, by government policy, the ability to practice their religion.

I believe that this bill can be an effective tool in helping to resolve the problem of religious persecution throughout the world.

The International Religious Freedom Act will establish a process to ensure that on an ongoing basis, the United States closely monitors religious persecution worldwide.

International Religious Freedom Act uses a broad definition of religious persecution. This definition ranges in scope from the most egregious form of religious persecution—imprisonment, torture or death—to the most common—the inability of one to speak freely about one's religion, or to change religion. That's right. There are prohibitions in certain countries on changing your religion, on talking about your religion, or practicing your religion.

This is an important aspect of the bill. If the definition of religious persecution were limited to only torture, imprisonment or death, the International Religious Freedom Act would only cover about a few countries, and would not include about 80 to 85 percent of the religious persecution that takes place in the world—the ability to practice one's religion. We adopted this standard to ensure that we address the problem before it escalates to torture and murder.

Under the provisions of the International Religious Freedom Act, the President is required to take action against those countries that engage in religious persecution. However, the President is given a menu of options, fifteen items, from which he can choose the most appropriate response. In addition, the President is given the discretion to calibrate that action in response to each country's particular situation.

In essence, this allows the President to weigh a variety of factors such as strategic importance, the historical relationship between the United States and that country and the severity of the religious persecution in that country when determining an action.

I believe this flexibility also makes the International Religious Freedom Act more effective. We provide the President with a menu of options that makes it make likely that he will take action.

We need to keep our eye on the goal. The goal of our bill is not to punish countries, but to change behavior, and if it is more likely that the President will take an action, then it is more likely that behavior will change. And that, Mr. President, in my opinion should be the goal of any legislation dealing with religious persecution—changing behavior in other countries that persecute people because of their faith.

The International Religious Freedom Act, also seeks to promote religious freedom. The bill insists that U.S. foreign assistance should place a priority on developing legal protections and respect for religious freedom, by promoting exchanges and visits of religious leaders in the U.S. and abroad, and by making one of the priorities of our international broadcast programs the

promotion of and respect for religious freedom.

This bill is not a classic case of Uncle Sam imposing his views on the world. Although the right to religious freedom undergirds the very existence and origin of this country, the bill only asks other countries to live up to the commitments they have made in international documents and agreements.

For example, article 1, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations states one of the purposes of the United Nations is to:

Achieve international cooperation in . . . promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinctions as to race, sex, language or religion.

There are 185 members of the United Nations. Some of the members of the United Nations are the biggest violators of the right to religious freedom.

Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief and freedom either alone or in community with others and in public or private to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

According to a CRS memo, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was originally adopted in 1948 at the UN by 48 of the countries that belonged to the UN at that time (eight countries abstained). The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is considered as a part of the United Nations and any country who has joined since 1948 subscribes to its principles. No ratification is required.

Some have suggested that it is inappropriate to elevate religion to a "higher" or "privileged" status in U.S. policy on human rights. But the reality is the opposite. We are trying to correct the neglect that has too long existed, where religious persecution has been given a lower priority than persecution based on political opinion, labor activities, sexual orientation, what have you. This bill is remedial for years of neglect. Religion must no longer be an afterthought of American human rights policy.

As the Catholic Conference stated in its letter to me:

The bill is a reasonable and thoughtful effort to ensure that religious liberty has its rightful place in U.S. policy while preserving the authority of the Executive to pursue legitimate foreign policy goals. It deserves broad, bipartisan support and should be considered before Congress adjourns.

In June of this year, an Episcopalian Bishop from Pakistan, the Right Reverend Munawar Rumlash, or Bishop Manno as he is called in the United States, gave gripping testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about the plight of Christians in Pakistan.

Bishop Manno cited the following examples of religious persecution in Pakistan before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that have occurred this year alone.

In January, Protestant Pastor Noor Alam was stabbed to death in front of his family. Two months before his death, Pastor Alam's church was demolished by a Muslim mob. When he was stabbed to death he was in the process of rebuilding his church for which he had received several death threats.

On April 27, 1998, Ayub Masih was condemned to death on charges he blasphemed the prophet Mohammed by favorably mentioning Salman Rushdie, the author of "Satanic Verses." According to Freedom House, Mr. Rushdie's book has not been translated into the local Urdu language and is unavailable in Pakistan. It is improbable that Ayub Masih ever saw or read the book.

The blasphemy laws in Pakistan do not just impact Christians. According to the latest State Department Human Rights Report, the Ahmadis, a minority sect of Islam that does not accept Mohammed as the last prophet of Islam, also suffer from the religious policies in Pakistan.

Another country in the Middle East imprisoned some 30 Christians for distributing religious material just three months ago. There were credible reports that these people were beaten while in jail.

In Nepal, Hinduism is the state religion and it is illegal to convert. Several years ago a gentleman from Oklahoma was arrested for distributing religious material. I worked with our government to get him released from prison.

Just recently The American Coptic Association placed an ad in the Washington Times highlighting the trials that they are going through. I think there are something like 12 million Copts in Egypt today.

Last summer our Government prepared a report on countries that engage in violations of religious freedom. Some 77 countries were listed in that report. I will include that report at the conclusion of my statement.

This is a problem, and we in the Senate have the power to try to do something to make improvements. That is what this bill is for. I believe the International Religious Freedom Act has the potential to significantly improve religious freedom throughout the world.

Mr. President, what was a mere resolution in 1996, I hope will become a reality in 1998. While in 1996 we acted with words, I hope we can act now with deeds by passing the International Religious Freedom Act.

I thank my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, for his leadership, and Senator COATS, who has worked on this very, very hard, and the 29 cosponsors that we have on this bill. I urge my colleagues to look at this bill, and to work with us to see if we can't pass this bill and make a very positive statement as the United States being a real leader to promote religious freedom throughout the world. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the countries that were included in the report on human rights and persecution listed in 1997 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTRIES LISTED IN 1997 REPORT ON
CHRISTIAN PERSECUTION

1. Afghanistan: Islam is the state religion. No Proselytizing allowed by non-Muslims.
2. Algeria: Islam is the state religion. Islamic extremists killed several Catholics in 1996.
3. Armenia: Laws forbid proselytizing except by the Apostolic Church. All churches must register with the government. Funding restrictions tightened so foreign-based churches may not be supported by funds outside Armenia.
4. Austria: Registration requirements for recognition. Recognition by the government means tax privileges. The Jehovah's Witness have not been recognized by the government.
5. Azerbaijan: No proselytizing by foreigners in Azerbaijan. Non-Orthodox Christian religions have credibly complained of official harassment.
6. Bahrain: Islam is the state religion. Proselytizing by non-Muslims is discouraged. Anti-Islamic writings are illegal. Both the Sunni and the Shi'a Muslim are subject to government control and monitoring.
7. Bangladesh: Islam is state religion. Foreign missionaries may proselytize, but their right to do so is not protected by the constitution. Many foreign missionaries have problems getting visas.
8. Belarus: Government directive issued in 1995 limits religious activity of foreign religious workers. The Orthodox Church is granted tax and financial advantages not given to other churches.
9. Belgium: The government provides subsidies to Catholics, Protestants, Judaism, Islam, Anglicanism, and the Greek and Russian Orthodox Church. Baptists and other evangelical churches were denied recognition.
10. Bhutan: Buddhism is the state religion. Conversion is illegal. Foreign missionaries are not allowed to proselytize, but they can operate educational and humanitarian efforts.
11. Bosnia: The government has ignored Catholic church burnings.
12. Brunei: Despite constitutional provisions providing for the full and unconstrained exercise of religious freedom the government routinely restricts non-Muslim religions by banning the importing of religious material and prohibiting proselytizing.
13. Bulgaria: Although the constitution calls for freedom of religion the government restricts this right for some non-Orthodox Christian groups. Mormons and the Jehovah's Witness have reported acts of official harassment.
14. Burma: The government has imposed restrictions on certain religious minorities. Christian bibles translated into local languages cannot be imported, and it is difficult to get permission to build churches and mosques.
15. Burundi: There is no restriction on religion. However, religious leaders of the Hutu tribe have been arrested for aiding Hutu rebels. Another religious leader was arrested and has not been charged.
16. Cameroon: The government has registration requirements and has verbally attacked the Catholic Church for being supportive of the political opposition.
17. Central African Republic: Has a provisions of law prohibiting religious fundamen-

talism which is understood to be aimed at Muslims.

18. China: The government seeks to restrict religious practice to government controlled and sanctioned religious organizations. Leaders of house churches have been jailed and beaten.

19. Colombia: Jehovah's Witness and members of the Mennonite Church have complained that they are not allowed an alternative to military service even though Colombia's constitution calls for this.

20. Comoros: A government established council ensures that its laws abide with the law of Islam. Non-Muslims are allowed to practice their faith, but not proselytize.

21. Congo: Religious leaders have been jailed for criticizing the government.

22. Croatia: The government discriminates against Muslims in issuing documents.

23. Cuba: Although restrictions on religion have eased—especially because of the Pope's visit—the government still maintains a restriction on selling business machines to Churches. Pentecostal Churches have been closed in the last year.

24. Djibouti: Islam is the state Religion. Proselytizing while not illegal is discouraged.

25. Egypt: Religious practices that conflict with Islamic law are prohibited. Christians complain that their lives and property are not adequately protected by the police. Converts to Christ have been beaten and jailed.

26. Equatorial Guinea: Catholic clergy beaten & jailed for political sermons.

27. Eritrea: General religious freedom, except the Jehovah's Witness are denied government housing and passports.

28. Estonia: Some disputes have arisen over its registration requirements, but this has not hampered freedom of religion.

29. Ethiopia: Skirmishes between religions have resulted in claims by the Protestants that they are not being adequately protected by the police.

30. France: Certain churches get government subsidies. Some 172 religions have been labeled as a criminal sect.

31. Germany: Certain churches get government subsidies.

32. Greece: Muslims complain the government is thwarting their efforts to build a mosque in Athens. Mormons, Jehovah's Witness and Scientologists have been arrested by the police for proselytizing.

33. India: The government has refused to allow foreign missionaries into the country for long stays since the 1960s. Missionaries can stay for short periods of time on a tourist visa only.

34. Indonesia: The government only recognizes five religions (Islam, Catholics, Protestant, Buddhism and Hinduism). Marriages performed outside of these religions have difficulty being recognized. The Jehovah's Witness have been banned.

35. Iran: There are religious restrictions on non Shiites. Christians are arrested. Two Bahai men were killed under circumstances that has led many to believe they were killed for their beliefs.

36. Iraq: Restrictions on religion exist. There is a ban on Muslims call to prayer in certain cities and bans on books and funeral processions. Security forces are reported to have killed between 40 and 500 religious pilgrims.

37. Israel: Jehovah's Witness have reported buildings being looted, and complain that the police have not adequately investigated these attacks.

38. Jordan: Non-Muslims can't proselytize to Muslims. Some religions not recognized by the government.

39. Kazakhstan: Foreign missionaries have complained of harassment by low-level government officials.

40. Kenya: Government has interfered with religious educations which it claims supported the opposition.

41. North Korea: Although the constitution calls for freedom of religion the government discourages all religious activity.

42. Kuwait: Islam is the state religion. The government prohibits proselytizing among Muslims.

43. Kyrgyz Republic: The government does not always ensure religious freedom. A Baptist congregation has been denied the ability to register with the government.

44. Laos: The government restricts religious freedom. There are reports of Christians being harassed. There are also restrictions on the imports of foreign religious publications.

45. Latvia: Religions are required to register. Jehovah's Witness are denied registration. This makes it very difficult for them as they are perceived as an illegal group.

46. Lebanon: Religious denomination determines who can hold the highest positions in government.

47. Lithuania: While the government generally allows freedom of religion, certain religions are having trouble getting registered.

48. Malaysia: Islam is the state religion. There are some restrictions on other religions.

49. Maldives: Severe restrictions on religion. Citizens are required to be Muslim. Conversions may result in a loss of citizenship. The practice of any other religion besides Islam is prohibited.

50. Mauritania: Proselytizing by non-Muslims prohibited. Conversion from Islam to another religion is prohibited.

51. Mexico: Local official do not always allow religious freedom.

52. Moldova: A 1992 law contains restrictions on proselytizing. Several Protestant religions are concerned that this could inhibit their activities.

53. Morocco: Islam is the official religion. Attempts to convert a Muslim are illegal and several Christian missionaries have been expelled from Morocco for proselytizing.

54. Nepal: Conversion and proselytizing are prohibited.

55. Nicaragua: Catholic Church bombings in 1996 blamed on extremists..

56. Nigeria: Open-air religious services are banned. Soldiers beat participants in an Easter-day parade.

57. Pakistan: Religious intolerance prevails. Blasphemy laws make it difficult for other religions besides Islam to grow. Proselytizing among Muslims is illegal.

58. Peru: Mormons harassed in Peru in 1996, problem declining.

59. Romania: Problems with low-level government harassment of several Protestant denominations.

60. Russia: Passed law that prohibits religious freedom in 1997. While this law is complex and contradictory, several denominations have been punished by local authorities for practicing their faith.

61. Saudi Arabia: No freedom of religion exists. The government does not permit non-Muslim religious activities. Police have been known to beat and jail those who do.

62. Serbia: Although there generally is freedom of religion, the government gives preferential treatment to the Orthodox Church.

63. Singapore: Jehovah's Witness are banned. Arrests have been made of them.

64. Slovakia: Subsidies provided to registered churches.

65. Somalia: Proselytizing prohibited except for Muslims.

66. Sri Lanka: Buddhism is the official national religion. Discrimination from the Buddhist clergy is often targeted at Christian groups who have proselytized.

67. Sudan: Islam is the de facto state religion. There are reports of forced conversion of Christians to Islam, Christians are victims of slave raids and Christian children being sent to reeducation camps. Muslims may proselytize, but non-Muslims cannot.

68. Syria: The President of Syria must be Muslim. The government discourages proselytizing. Jews are generally barred from holding government positions. Reports indicate that the government closely monitors worship services.

69. Tunisia: The government views proselytizing as an act against public order. Foreigners suspected of proselytizing are deported. The government controls mosques and pays the salaries of the prayer leader.

70. Turkey: there is compulsory religious education for Muslims. proselytizing is not illegal, but foreign missionaries are sometimes arrested for disturbing the peace.

71. Turkmenistan: Churches are required to be registered by the government. Requirements that the church have at least 500 adherents have hampered the efforts of some religions from setting up legal religious organizations. Missionaries arriving at the airport with religious material have had that material confiscated.

72. Ukraine: An amendment to a 1991 law restricts the activities of non-native churches. Local government officials have impeded the efforts of foreign missionaries.

73. United Arab Emirates: Islam is the official religion. Non-Muslims are free to worship, but may not proselytize, or distribute religious material.

74. United Kingdom: Has a state religion. Blasphemy is illegal although the law is not enforced. There is freedom of religion.

75. Uzbekistan: Although the distribution of religious material is legal, proselytizing is not. The government does not register Christian groups of which they do not approve, and has sought to control the Islamic hierarchy.

76. Vietnam: Only two Christian religions are approved by the government—The Catholics and the Christian Missionary Alliance. Police have raided house churches and harassed ethnic Hmong Protestant for proselytizing.

77. Yemen: Islam is the state religion. There are restrictions on the followers of other religions—They are not allowed to proselytize. Security officials have been known to censor the mail of Christian clergy who minister to the foreign population.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BIDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for up to 30 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE IMPEACHMENT PROCESS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, during the past 26 years as a U.S. Senator, I, like all who sit here, have been confronted with some of the most significant issues that have faced our Nation in the last quarter century—issues ranging from who sits on the highest court of the land, the Supreme Court, to whether or not we should go to war. These and others are, obviously, weighty issues. But none of the decisions has been more awesome, or more daunting, or more compelling than the

issue of whether to impeach a sitting President of the United States of America, a responsibility that no Senator will take lightly.

As imposing as this undertaking is, I am sad to say that I have had to contemplate this issue twice during my service as a U.S. Senator—once during the term of President Richard Milhous Nixon, and now.

While the circumstances surrounding these two events are starkly different, the consequences are starkly the same. The gravity of removing a sitting President from office is the same today as it was 26 years ago. And 26 years ago as a much younger U.S. Senator, I took to the floor on April 10, 1974, and said the following:

In the case of an impeachment trial, the emotions of the American people would be strummed, as a guitar, with every newscast and each edition of the daily paper in communities throughout the country. The incessant demand for news or rumors of news—whatever its basis of legitimacy—would be overwhelming. The consequential impact on the Federal institutions of government would be intense—and not necessarily beneficial. This is why my plea today [that was 1974] is for restraint on the part of all parties involved in the affair.

It is somewhat presumptuous for any Senator to quote himself. But I cite it to point out that my views then with a Republican President are the same as my views today with the Democratic U.S. President. It is time for all parties involved in this affair to show restraint.

I rise today because I believe that we are not exercising the restraint as we should. Those words that I said 24 years ago have an uncanny ring to them. Furthermore, in 1974, I urged my colleagues in the U.S. Senate during the Watergate period to learn from the story of Alice in Wonderland. I cautioned then that they remember Alice's plight when the Queen declared, "Sentence first and verdict afterwards." But the need for restraint then is even greater now than it was in 1974.

The impeachment question then was not as politically charged as it is today. In 1974, we were willing to hear all the evidence before we made any decision. We had men like Howard Baker and Sam Ervin. We had men like Chairman Peter Rodino. We had Democrats and Republicans. I remember a brilliant young Senator from Maine, who was then a Congressman named William Cohen, a Republican, and now our Secretary of Defense. He was a Congressman from Maine. I remember how serious they took the process, how much restraint they showed, and how bipartisan their actions were.

Today, I hope for our Nation's sake—not the President's, but for our Nation's sake—that we don't follow the Queen's directive in Alice in Wonderland to "sentence first and verdict afterwards," and that we will make a wise judgment about the fate of the President after deliberate consideration.

My legal training combined with more than a quarter of a century of experience

in the U.S. Senate, a significant part of that as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has taught me several important lessons. Two of these are lessons that I believe are appropriate now. First is that an orderly society must first care about justice; and, second, all that is constitutionally permissible may not be just or wise.

Let me repeat the latter. All that is constitutionally permissible to do may be not wise to do, or may not be just in the doing.

It is with these two very important lessons guiding me that I embark upon a very important decision involving our country, our Constitution and our President. The power to overturn and undo a popular election by the people for the first time in our Nation's history must be exercised with great care and with sober deliberation.

We should not forget that 47.4 million Americans voted for our President in 1996, and 8.2 million voted for the President's opponent. We should also not forget, as I tell my students in the constitutional law class I teach on separation of powers, that the entire essence of our constitutional system is built upon the notion of the consent of the governed, and when we deign to overturn a decision of the governed, we are on very thin ice.

I believe Members of Congress should begin their deliberation with a thorough understanding of the impeachment process. They should understand what the framers of the Constitution intended the standard of impeachment to be. I have heard no discussion of that issue thus far. And, further, how the framers of the Constitution intended the process to work; again, I have heard no discussion of that thus far.

Let me say at the outset that what President Clinton did and acknowledged to have done is reprehensible. It was, at a minimum, a horrible lapse in judgment, and it has brought shame upon him personally. It has brought shame upon the Office of the Presidency, and his actions have hurt his family, his friends, his supporters, the causes for which he fights, and the country as a whole. I am confident that he fully understands the gravity of what he has done now.

Let me also say that I have made no judgment. I have not made any decision on what I think should happen. I have not come to any conclusion as to consequences the President should face for his shameful behavior, because I believe the oath of office that I have taken on five solemn occasions—four which were right here in the well, and one which was in a hospital in Wilmington, DE—on those five occasions, the oath that I took I believe precludes me, and I will respectfully suggest any other Senator, from prejudging, as I and all other Senators may be required to serve as the Constitution dictates, as judge and juror in what may become the trial of this century. I can only make—and I would respectfully suggest